

**To:** Grantham, Nancy[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]  
**From:** StClair, Christie  
**Sent:** Tue 9/29/2015 6:57:26 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Response to your questions regarding Gold King Mine

Hi Nancy, are you going to do an intro email?

Thanks,  
Christie

**Christie St. Clair**

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

**From:** Grantham, Nancy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 23, 2015 1:47 PM  
**To:** EOC Public Information; StClair, Christie; Purchia, Liz; Harrison, Melissa; Bressler, Lindsey; Grantham, Nancy; Jenkins, Laura Flynn  
**Cc:** Foster, Althea; Barry, Michael  
**Subject:** FW: Response to your questions regarding Gold King Mine

FYI ... this is a followup to the Huffington Post visit to the mine and followup visit to the Durango ICP.

EOC PIO – how do you want to coordinate the responses to the questions below?

Thanks ng

**From:** Lisa Marie Jacobs [REDACTED] **Personal Email/Ex. 6**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 23, 2015 11:40 AM  
**To:** Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>; Cherri Foytlin [REDACTED] **Personal Email/Ex. 6**  
**Subject:** Re: Response to your questions regarding Gold King Mine

Dear Ms. Grantham,

Thank you for providing the additional information, however, we still have some unanswered questions.

Without a plume model, it seems that the sampling plan lacks pertinent information. Specifically, how does the sampling plan provide statistically meaningful information on the plume itself? The aerial photographs do not provide any information about what is happening on the bottom of the river, or the flora and soil on the riverbanks or its tributaries. The plan mentions Region 8, but not Region 6 or 9. It seems to omit Colorado altogether. Are there separate plans for each region?

The interim plan seems to lack any input from veterinarians, medical toxicologists or agricultural toxicologists. How will EPA assess potential health impacts to humans, wildlife, livestock and crops?

Also, we had requested information about the concentrations in the containment ponds. We viewed three ponds where lime is being added, which we understand results in heavy metals forming hydroxates that fall to the bottom. How will that waste be dealt with? Will it be tested for safety, and where will it end up? How will the EPA determine when the ponds will be opened and released downstream? Is there a plan to monitor those discharges?

Again, we thank you for your help,

Lisa Marie Jacobs

The ALERT Project, a project of Earth Island Institute

970-903-6818

Cherri Foytlin

Bridge the Gulf

Huffington Post

On Sun, Sep 13, 2015 at 7:41 AM, Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)> wrote:

Hi Lisa Marie,

Good meeting you in Durango. I hope you are well. We wanted to send you responses and updates to your questions.

Attached are copies of the sampling plans for the teams working on the effort. I hope they are helpful. You will see that some are marked interim and I wanted to note that it is not uncommon for sampling plans to be called interim final as they are designed to be updated/re-evaluated as conditions/needs change during the response.

I don't have the names of the laboratories but will send them along when I get them. You asked me about plume modeling during the incident. As far as we can tell, none of the response organizations conducted plume modeling to project the movement down the river. We did fly our aircraft, ASPECT, to monitoring the plume as it progressed. Photos from ASPECT can be found here - <https://flic.kr/p/y6Nf1s> , <https://flic.kr/p/y6UyZX> , <https://flic.kr/p/ym6N9o> , <https://flic.kr/p/yp953R>. The four treatment ponds allow use to reduce the amount of suspended metals and adjust the PH before the mine water flows into the creek. The sediment in the ponds will be tested and the results will determine the

appropriate disposal. Disposal isn't taking place yet since they are still in use.

The time of NPL listing varies based on a lot of different factors (how quickly the preliminary assessment/site inspection can be done, the Hazard Ranking System (HRS) score, support by the community and state, and more). That said – once all of those things are done – sites are proposed to the NPL twice a year and published in the Federal Register for comment. In general – it takes 12 to 18 months to move from proposed to final. But a lot of work has to happen before a site is proposed to the NPL.

Thank you.

Nancy Grantham

857-829-8250